THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVII DECEMBER, 1944 No. 294

Editorial

ONE of the things which the discussions that have proceeded in our pages during the past year have shown to be up for reconsideration is the conception of a National Church. Many people seem to think that the idea of a National Church is necessarily insular, provincial, uncatholic and schismatic. This notion will be dispelled for those who read Dr Dvornik's recently published *National Churches and the Church Universal* (Dacre Press, 2s.). He shows with a wealth of historical evidence from East and West that "the problem of nationality and universality in the Church is as old as Christendom and the whole evolution of Christianity down to our own days is characterized by repeated attempts, more or less successful, at discovering the right balance between the national and universal elements present in the Church founded by Jesus Christ" (p. 5). The attempt to discover the right balance must be continued, and not abandoned as it would be by the triumph of one element over the other.

The Church of England is patently a National Church, and ought not to apologize for the fact. Moreover, the Anglican Communion consists of a large number of autonomous National Churches; its constitution rests on the assumption that National Churches "will give their best contribution to the life of the Church Universal if allowed to grow up freely in their own soil, and to develop under local conditions".[1] The Anglican protest against Romanism is a protest not against universality, but against an attempt to achieve a false form of universality by overriding the rightful element of nationality in the Church Universal.

There is no necessary contradiction between universality and nationality in the Church. Moreover, a Church can be both universal and national, however small its numbers. "The universal church . . . stands, the great representative of mankind—redeemed and restored mankind—and this it would do though it had but a dozen members, and though but one of these members really understood his position."[2] Likewise, a Church can be national, though its members are a small minority in a nation. It can be national without being either established or recognized, provided it takes its responsibility for and to the nation seriously.

It is common to speak of a "National Church" and a "State Church" as though the terms were interchangeable. But a State Church is quite a different proposition. This may take two forms. A Church may be

[1] Lambeth Conference, 1908. Report of the Committee on "Organization in the Anglican Communion."

[2] F. D. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ* (1838), i. 46.

regarded as a creature or department of the State, its doctrine and order being determined by the civil government. That is what is liable to come about in authoritarian States. In democratic States the emphasis is put elsewhere. It is then tempting to suppose that the doctrine and order of the Church ought to be determined, not by the government, but by the will of the people. Where the people hold a variety of religious beliefs, a State Church is so designed as to accommodate them all, or as many as possible. In this case the test of a Church's faith and order ceases to be its consistency with the faith and order of the Church Universal and becomes its compliance with the will of a particular nation or a majority thereof. If the issue is posed thus, we do not apprehend that there is any likelihood that the Church of England will become a State Church. But the issue may not be posed as sharply as this, and that is why a careful watch must be kept on the advocacy of national religion.

There are those who allege that the Church of England is already and irrevocably compromised by a certain ambiguity in its formularies, which is taken to mean that it is more concerned to provide for the various beliefs of the English people than to maintain a faithful witness to the revealed Word of God. But this is a fallacy. Where the Anglican formularies are ambiguous, they are so because the testimony of the Scriptures, which is the rule of faith, is ambiguous too. Thus by rejecting certain one-sided definitions, which overthrow the balance of Scripture, the Church of England preserves its witness to the truth of the Gospel. This point was made by Archbishop Magee, when criticizing the writer of a tract on Prayer Book revision in 1870:

> What an ignorance of the first principles of the subject he shows, when he talks of insisting on "unambiguous" formularies. How can our formularies be less ambiguous than the truths they are to express? and if there are truths—*e.g.*, that of sacramental grace—not defined in Scriptures how are they to be made definite in our Liturgy, save by losing some of their truth, and so seeming one-sided—*i.e.*, erroneous?
>
> Transubstantiation and Zwinglianism are both definite and both erroneous. Our formularies lie within these two boundaries, touching both because they are between them, and therefore "ambiguous"—*i.e.*, broad and catholic.[1]

This is the true ground of Anglican comprehension; but this also, like the conception of a National Church, is liable to be turned into something quite different—namely, the idea of including in one Church as many varieties of Christianity as possible or as many as the people want. It is against that perverted comprehensiveness that our reviewer of the Bishop of Sheffield's Visitation Charge utters a forceful warning, which we hope will be as much appreciated by our readers (though for some it may be recondite) as we are confident it will be endorsed by the Bishop.

[1] J. C. Macdonnell, *Life of Archbishop Magee* (1896), i. 253*f*.

The Word of God

THE Word of God as a theological term has its roots in the Old Testament prophets. In early days the prophets were indeed seers rather than hearers (1 Sam. ix, 9), whose message came to them pictorially. This element recedes into the background but never completely disappears. Even Ezekiel's message is largely delivered in the form of pictures. In Jesus Christ, as we shall see, both seeing and hearing find their final fulfilment—in Him the Word is *seen* as well as heard (1 John i, 1). Yet in the later prophets it remains true that they receive and deliver their message in the form of words more than of pictures.

The prophets use the term Word of God to denote in the first place the utterance they themselves receive from God. Then, secondly and derivatively, their communication of this utterance to God's people is also called the Word of God. (*Cf.* Jer. ii, 4*ff.* with Jer. ii, 1-3.) The content of the utterance is always the revelation of God's will and purpose, which has been, is being and will be worked out in history. But the revelation is never merely a detached comment upon history. When uttered, the Word becomes a factor, the decisive factor, in the historical process. God's Word is always God's act. In Him there is no disparity, as with men, between words and deeds. His Word is act because His Word is truth. When God's Word comes to a prophet it is such that it can be apprehended by his mind. Like human thoughts, it can be reproduced in human words. But that is not to say that the prophet could have deduced that Word from his own previous knowledge, or that he could have reached it by ordinary processes of intuition. The Word *comes* to him (Jer. i, 2) from outside. It is supra-historical in origin. The prophet is seized upon by the Spirit of God, and only thus can he apprehend the Word (2 Sam. xxiii, 1*ff.*). Of course the prophet passes through a religious experience. Jeremiah talks of "eating" God's words (Jer. xv, 16). The significance, however, lies not in the experience—that is not the burden of Jeremiah's message, though he more than all other prophets talks of the accompanying experience—rather both his experience and his message are created and constituted by the Word of the Lord. That Word is always subject, even when it appears to be object (as when Jeremiah "eats" the Word or proclaims it). Thus, while the Bible does not deny religious experience, that experience never becomes the basis of Biblical theology. That basis is in the Word of God.

The Word declared by the prophets is a word of judgment and mercy, of wrath and love. In the pre-exilic prophets the judgment was more prominent, after the Exile mercy is more to the fore. But—and this is the most important point of all—the judgment and the mercy are never exhausted by the events of the Exile and Restoration. Neither God's judgment nor His mercy has yet fallen on Israel to the full. The Word of the Lord still awaits complete fulfilment. This is obvious in the specifically Messianic prophecies, but it is true of the prophetic writings as a whole. The Word of God in the prophets is

provisionary, preparatory and fragmentary (Heb. i,1). It is enigmatic, and awaits a final Word from God for its elucidation.

The Law.—The Law, too, is an utterance of Jahveh, and therefore the Law, too, can be called His Word. First, the Decalogue is called the Word of God, then the whole of Deuteronomy and thence the whole of the Pentateuch legislation. As the Word of Jahveh the Law is His revealed will for man, not a human ideal. Like the Word of the prophets, the Law is also under a question mark. For though God's Word will fulfil itself (Isa. lv, 10 *ff.*), yet Israel is continually faithless to the covenant which this Word inaugurates. Therefore this Word looks forward to a New Covenant, to the fulfilment of God's revealed will (Jer. xxxi, 31 *ff.*). The Word of the Law points beyond itself to a further event in which it will be fulfilled, an event in which perfect obedience will be rendered by a reconstituted Israel.

The Word in Creation.—After the Exile, the Law and the Prophets as a whole came to be regarded as the Word of God. At the same time there emerges an apparently new usage. In the priestly narrative of the creation not only the Law and the Prophets but also the creation is the sphere of God's activity in His Word. This, however, is already made possible by the dynamic conception of the Word of God in the prophets. The implication of Genesis i is the same as that so frequently asserted by the second Isaiah (*e.g.*, xlii, 5 *ff.*)—the God who by His Word called Israel and watched over her destiny is the same God who created the heavens and the earth. *Cf.* Psalm xxxiii, 9 and cxlvii, 15-18.

The term Word of God comes to rest in the Old Testament period as a technical term for the canonical revelation in the Law and the Prophets. Yet behind this apparently direct identification of the Scripture with the Word there lurks the consciousness that the Scripture is the Word of God only in a derivative sense; it is the testimony of Moses and the prophets to that primary Word which they had seen and heard.

The New Testament.—Jesus stood in the prophetic tradition. The spoken Word was with Him as with the prophets the main medium of His activity. Yet Jesus is more than a prophet. He introduces His words not with "Thus saith the Lord" but with "I say unto you." As with the prophets, His words are intended to awaken faith. But now it is faith not in some preliminary revelation of God's judgment and mercy, but in the Event to which the prophets had pointed—the coming of the Kingdom of God. In Jesus the Kingdom is already breaking in with power. The words of Jesus are His interpretation of this event. His words are also acts. *Ephphatha* and *Talitha cumi* accomplish what they say. They are the working of the power of the Kingdom of God. But Jesus Himself is the embodiment of the Kingdom of God. Therefore faith in the Kingdom means faith in Him. This is already so in the synoptic gospels (Mark x, 22; Matt. xv, 12). The fourth gospel serves to underline and clarify what has already been said by the synoptists when it appears to make His own Messianic Sonship the theme of Jesus' words instead of the Kingdom of God.

The words of Jesus in His earthly life, like His miracles, are not to

be understood in isolation, but in relation to His Death and Resurrection. Like the miracles, they are signs pointing forward to the final events in which the Kingdom comes. Perhaps that is why the epistles show an extraordinary reserve in quoting isolated words of Jesus, and why the teaching and preaching of Jesus are embedded in the framework of gospels whose climax is the Cross and Resurrection. For in the Cross and Resurrection the Word of God comes finally to rest—that is, both the Word as it is recorded in the Old Testament (hence the insistence on the fulfilment of scripture in the Passion narratives of the gospels) and also the Word as it is proclaimed in the words of Jesus. The Event for which the Old Testament Word was waiting has now happened.

The Apostolic Witness.—Outside the synoptic gospels the term Word of God or Word of the Lord is used most frequently of the Gospel or *kerygma* which the Apostles proclaimed. This Word is not the repetition of the Old Testament Word, but the Event of Jesus Christ crucified and risen to which the Old Testament Word had pointed. Just as the term Word of God was used by the prophets in the twofold sense of the revelation they received and of their own proclamation of it, so the apostles first apprehended the Word of God in Jesus Christ and then proclaimed this Word, which proclamation was itself also the Word of God in a secondary and derived sense. Compare Luke i, 1 and Acts xiii, 26 (reading ἡμῖν with Westcott and Hort) with Acts iv, 31.

This Word is always *God's* Word. God is always the subject even though the Word is spoken through the medium of the apostles. For they speak it only as the obedient servants of God. It is true that the Word of the Cross and Resurrection was spoken once and for all and that it can never be repeated. Yet the apostles' preaching is never merely the report of something that happened in the past. It is the representation of the Word in exactly the same way as the Sacrifice of Calvary is re-presented in the Eucharist. See especially Gal. iii, 1. In the apostles' preaching this Word is an active living force, evoking faith or provoking unbelief in Jesus Christ. Where it is proclaimed and accepted the Church comes into being.

The Johannine use of the term Logos in John i and 1 John i is not the sudden importation of an alien terminology but the direct outcome of the apostolic language. To say that Jesus Christ=the Word of God is but one step further than what is said in Luke i, 3 and in Acts xiii, 26, where Logos means all that happened in Jesus Christ. True, it had not yet been said that the Logos was pre-existent, yet in the synoptists, in Acts, and in the Pauline epistles the Logos which was spoken in Jesus Christ was the same Logos which was spoken fragmentarily in the prophets. This implies the pre-existence of the Logos. Again, Jesus Christ had already been spoken of by Paul as pre-existent, and when the Johannine writers explicitly identified Him with the Word of God the way is at once open for saying that the Logos was in the beginning with the Father, without thereby adding anything essentially new to Christian truth. The Logos is also said to have been the agent in creation. This again is no importation of an alien idea.

That Jesus Christ the pre-existent Son was the agent of creation is already a Pauline doctrine (Col. i, 16), while the Old Testament itself has asserted that the Word of God which was spoken by the prophets was also the mèdium whereby God created the world. In the synoptic gospels Jesus Himself, in dealing with the question of marriage, had reasserted the Word given in creation (Mark x, 6). When it is said that the Word became flesh this also is no new doctrine. It means simply that in Jesus Christ God's Word entered human history in concrete actuality. That was the whole burden of the apostles' preaching.

We saw that in the Old Testament the Law was also called the Word of God, and that this Word, too, was as yet unfulfilled. Christ is the fulfilment of the Law. He asserted this Himself (Matt. v, 17). It is one of Paul's favourite themes, and it is implied by the fact that the prologue of the fourth gospel takes over and applies to the Logos what Rabbinic writers had already said of the Torah.

The New Testament.—Christian theology has called the New Testament the Word of God. This is justifiable in so far as the New Testament preserves in writing the original apostolic witness to Jesus. The apostolic authorship of many books in the New Testament has been called in question by criticism. Yet even where those questionings are justified it remains true that the doubtful writings are the work of "those who, though belonging to a later generation, have been so completely created by apostolic witness and formed by apostolic obedience that they are veritably carried across into the company of the original disciples of Jesus and invested with the authority of their mission" (Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, i. 100 *f.*). The New Testament, as preserving the witness of the Apostles, is, like the Old Testament as preserving the witness of Moses and the prophets, the Word of God. But it is this in a secondary, derivative sense. The Word of God in a primary sense is Jesus Christ. To Him both Old and New Testaments bear witness.

There has long been a vague, uncomfortable feeling that owing to Biblical criticism we can no longer accept the Bible as the Word of God. That is true if we mean thereby that the Bible is in every letter and word guaranteed 100 per cent. true. This, however, is to make of God's Word an assured possession, as if God spoke it once and then left it in the hands of men; it is to make God's Word a dead, legalistic thing, and to divorce it from the person of Jesus Christ. Criticism is justified in contending that the Bible is involved in the limitations, fallibility and relativity inseparable from all human thought, speech and writing. The thought of the Bible is conditioned by the individuality and even the sinfulness of its authors; its speech by the limitations of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek as means of expression; its writing is rendered questionable by the uncertainty of textual tradition. Yet it has pleased God to place a heavenly treasure in this earthen vessel. Here the analogy of the Incarnation and the Sacraments may help. God's Word is spoken in the Person of Jesus. Outwardly and visibly He is a first-century Jew involved in the individuality, limitations and questionableness of an historical figure, but to the eye of

faith, illuminated by God's Holy Spirit, this same Jesus is perceived to be the eternal Son of God. God stoops, condescends to use σάρξ as the means of His self-revelation. The Blessed Sacrament outwardly and visibly is bread and wine, with all the limitations and perishability of such. Yet to faith, while not ceasing to be bread and wine, it is the Body and Blood of Christ. God stoops down, condescends to use these earthly things as a means of His self-giving. In the same way the Bible is outwardly and visibly a human book, or rather a collection of human books, with all that that implies in conditionedness and in liability to error. Yet to faith it is the Word of God, for through the Bible man meets face to face with Jesus Christ. God stoops down, condescends to use the Bible as the means of speaking His Word.

Preaching as the Word of God.—Christian theology has used the term Word of God in a third sense—that is, of preaching in the Church. This is because the Church has believed that when preaching takes place God is the subject. In preaching God speaks, God acts, God produces faith or provokes unbelief, God builds up the Church. God condescends to use the words of His ministers as He used the words of the apostles. Preaching, like the apostolic proclamation, is the re-presentation of the Word as the Eucharist is the re-presentation of the sacrifice of Calvary. The source of the Church's preaching is not in herself, for she consists of men still living in the world, and men to whom the Lord does not speak as He spoke to the prophets, men who cannot see, hear and handle the Word of Life as did the apostles. If she tries to find the source of her preaching in herself her preaching will be merely the expression of the spirit of the age, be it liberalism, nazism, or other human ideology. Therefore she must find the source of her preaching in the prophetic and apostolic testimony of Jesus Christ. Only then does her preaching become the Word of God. Therefore the Church's preaching is the Word of God in a derivative and tertiary sense. It is derived from the secondary sense, the Bible, which in its turn is derived from the primary sense, Jesus Christ.

As these words were written on St Bartholomew's Day it is fitting to close with the collect, in which all three meanings of the Word—Jesus Christ, the Biblical testimony and the Church's preaching—appear in their proper relation:

O almighty and everlasting God, who didst give to thine Apostle Bartholomew grace truly to believe and to preach thy Word; Grant, we beseech thee, unto thy Church, to love that Word which he believed, and to preach and receive the same; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

R. H. Fuller.

Ashbourne.

"G. K. C."

The mind of Chesterton was so many-sided that any biographer has but to capture him in one position in order to obtain a full-size portrait. So it is probable that we have seen only the first of such; and it is fitting

that it should be a deeply personal one, in which we meet Chesterton as a friend rather than as a theologian or a literatus.[1] There must be many who will feel that it is impossible to do justice to Chesterton's vision —such as it was—until one has first come to terms with his particular view of the universe; because, while he was never unique in the sense that such English men of letters as Donne or Swift or Dr Johnson were unique, he sometimes bewildered and exasperated people who might have grasped his essential genius if they had not mistaken some of his antics for the serious part of him and some of his profoundest utterances for whimsicalities or deliberate paradoxes.

The truth is that Chesterton was paradoxical—not out of perversity or any deliberation, nor yet, I think, from any psychological necessity in himself, but because he saw that the world itself was one gigantic paradox, and he stood on his head in order to see it the right way up. He was one of the few incredibly bold theorists in history to adopt this attitude as a consistent policy, and if the result of it was that he sometimes used the stars as footballs we shall do wisely to wink at it and remember that if a man of such stature puts his head in the earth his legs will almost certainly reach the skies. Of course there were occasions on which this kind of blind man's buff landed him in inexcusable wisecracks, as when he dismissed all Higher Criticism of the Bible as only "words about words; and what are words about such Words as these?" The thing could be blown to pieces with less than a square inch of his own dynamite—the kind of gunpowder that he used against those who decried Chaucer or Dickens; but if you stand on your head and your feet reach the stars any antics you perform are bound to have rather catastrophic results.

The mind that precipitated *Orthodoxy* like a fire bomb into the midst of a world that had taken most of its thinking from scientists was bound to treat humour as a cardinal virtue; and it is possible that the public read Chesterton (not always to the advantage of either) when it read no other orthodox thinker because he was the first to write about theology with "pep" and sparkle in an age when it was treated with too much solemnity. It is probably true that (and I say this as one who regards C. S. Lewis as at once more brilliant and more profound than Chesterton) the almost spectacular success of Mr C. S. Lewis's books in our own day would never have achieved such proportions if Chesterton had not blazed the trail for that *kind* of literature. In fact I think it would be no exaggeration to say that Mr Lewis has earned for Christianity in its broader aspect the kind of intellectual prestige that Chesterton regained for the Roman Catholic Church in a less cynical generation.

This brings me to the rather baffling problem of Chesterton's conversion to *Roman* Catholicism, for the more one studies that problem the more inexplicable it seems to be. He spent about two-thirds of his adult life in the Anglican Church, nor did he become a zealot or a bigot when he had "'verted" to Rome. It has been admitted that his friends had to get him out of bed, push him into a carriage and whip up the horses, to get him to Mass. It is true, of course, that

[1] *Gilbert Keith Chesterton.* By Maisie Ward. (Sheed and Ward, 21s.)

those were the days when, if an intellectual "'verted" at all, he "'verted" to Rome; but Chesterton was not one to be hidebound by the conventions of his age.

No, it seems to me that this problem will remain a baffling one until we face the fact that he made the change for psychological reasons rather than for theological or philosophical ones. There was something deep and fundamental in Chesterton that could be stirred by nothing less mighty than the great historical and ecclesiastical metropolis of Rome, that was a little revolted by the *bourgeois-mindedness* and mental insularity of typical Anglicanism. He could awaken to the call of history even if almost deaf to that of liturgy; and the atmosphere of tea-fights, mothers' meetings and parochial church councils, which smell rather a long way off in the Church of England, probably frightened him out of it even if he never came closer to it than an occasional meeting in some novel or the parish magazine. It was typical of the kind of attitude which prevailed a generation ago, before the advent of T. S. Eliot, Michael Roberts and C. S. Lewis to the "C. of E."—when an intellectual Christian was assumed to be a Roman Catholic; and if he turned out to be an Anglican, was regarded with the puzzled pity that one might extend towards a hybrid or a freak.

He was, of course, a child born out of time, and of nothing was this more true than of his literature. To Chesterton theology was never just one branch of study among others—all studies were branches of theology; and in this conviction—perhaps his profoundest—he posited a belief which the Catholic and Protestant worlds of the Renaissance shared with their medieval forebears. The converse—that theology is a branch of study among many—was a typical growth of that so-called "Age of Reason" of which Chesterton was an opponent all his thinking life—an opponent as pitiless as he was formidable. Of course the result of all this was that his theology got into his creative literature. It bristled and sparkled with essential religious truths. Arthur Conan Doyle, the man of medical science, gave us Sherlock Holmes with his tobacco, his test tubes and his mathematical deductions; but G. K. Chesterton gave us Father Brown. He saw crime—as he saw art, literature and science itself—as a thing of the soul. The criminal might have been a sick man; but he was, after all, one unit in a world that was sick—with that strange sickness and home-sickness that reveal Man at once as the child of Heaven, even if at times he has given his allegiance to Hell. This gave Chesterton a new sense of proportion that was at times staggering. He was one of the very few men in Europe who saw this war coming directly the last one was over; and he saw that the cauldron would boil up over Poland.

It is probable that, as a purely literary figure, Chesterton was not great, and I believe this to be because what I would call the "theological unity" of his art blurred the edges. *The Napoleon of Notting Hill* was almost as much a philosophy as it was a psychological romance and there was in much of his poetry more of the fine essence of dramatic unity than pure poetry—of which *The Ballad of the White Horse* is a very fine example; but its rollicking grandeur never quite captured the

spirit of the age. Hardy somehow captured that age with his genuine eye for green and shadows, as did Lawrence with his savage ecstasies and Virginia Woolf with her superb artistry; but I suppose it was Aldous Huxley—the antithesis of Chesterton—who took the whole citadel by storm with an almost gentle irony tempered with a devastating eye for truth. To Chesterton it was a world of pygmies—as the world of Dickens had been one of giants. Why, even Chaucer had created farmyard animals who could talk about God! But Mr Huxley gave us children of God who thought, behaved and talked like farmyard animals. It was monstrous, but it was inevitable, a sign that England had lost her sense of proportion when she lost her Faith. Chesterton was medieval in the accidents of his thought as well as in its substance, and it was no coincidence that he abominated speed and all the modern methods of practising it.

I said earlier that he was never unique in the sense that Dr Johnson was unique; but I should like to qualify that statement by adding that there was something Johnsonian about the magnanimity of his loves despite limitations and the fact that he was not a good hater,[1] and it was this combination of mighty loyalties with an ability to laugh about those whom he might have hated that gave to his thought the keen edge of a born satirist. Hence those games of football with the stars; and hence that amazing zest for living that caused him to bloom like a midsummer tree in the midst of a commercial city.

His loves, moreover, go largely into categories, and in that, as in many other respects, he was not unlike a child. He once said of Mr H. G. Wells that, in hating the soldier and the priest, he had "hated nearly everything that had ever happened"; and that was Chesterton to the core. He loved things and people not simply for what they were but for what they stood for in history—or perhaps eternity. To him Man was always *The Everlasting Man*, and it is fitting that the last of his big religious works should have taken its title from this absolutely fundamental principle of his thought.

It is probable that the next generation will see a spate of biographies of Chesterton. For he was as spectacular as some of the legendary figures in whom he delighted and almost as much an object of speculation; but there was nothing "legendary" about his thought. Indeed, it is a cause for astonishment that a thinker who prided himself on his conservatism in literature and religion should have proved to be a disturbing, almost volcanic, upheaval in the life of his own day. The first of such books has, despite its bulk, given us little more than a glimpse of the man who flashed suddenly across the page of history, leaving many more problems than answers behind him; and it is now for future critical studies to deal with those very live problems and perhaps to answer some of them in the light of the trail he so magnificently blazed.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

LONDON.

[1] It was Charles Lamb who once said of hating: "How could I hate him? Don't I know him? I never could hate anyone that I know," and with that sentiment Chesterton would have been in sympathy.

CORRESPONDENCE

ANGLICAN LEADERSHIP COURSES IN THE R.A.F.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

As you remarked in a footnote to Mr Guy Bowden's article entitled "The Layman and Theology" in your September issue, Leadership Courses for Anglicans have been started in the R.A.F. Chaplains choose men of all ranks who, by their worship, witness and work, have shown some qualities of Christian leadership on their stations. They are then attached for a Course lasting five days to Magdalene College, Cambridge. In a few weeks we shall also be able to take members of the W.A.A.F., officers and airwomen. It is extremely encouraging that these courses have the full support of the Air Ministry.

Five days are all too short. We could lengthen the course, but to do so would mean that fewer men and women would be able to come. There is already a long waiting list. We have found, as Mr Bowden suggested would be the case, that our main difficulty is to decide what to leave out of the program.

The men arrive on Saturday evening, when there is a talk on the purpose of the course—that we should consider together ways in which we can make our Christian ministry, both of clergy and laity, more effective. On Sunday there are three instructions on Prayer in the College Chapel. Christians do, as Mr Bowden points out, find much difficulty in praying; and our first task is to help them, not only by insisting on its primary place among Christian exercises, but also by teaching them, or rather by helping them to learn their own best methods. These instructions are at such times as allow them to attend services in the parish churches of Cambridge. In the Forces men get few opportunities for taking part in the worship of the parish churches, and they welcome this.

On the next three days they are worked hard—two lectures in the morning, two in the afternoon, and another session after supper. Each talk is followed by discussion in small groups or by general questioning and discussion. Not one has said that this is too much. Many go on talking informally long after the last lecture has finished.

The subject for Monday's lectures is "The Need for Leadership." Lecturers sketch a picture of the prevailing lack of direction in life, not least in the sphere of morals. They try to show that the modern confidence in science and a more rationalized education as panaceas is doomed to be shaken, unless the Spirit of Christ informs both scientists and educationists. In Tuesday's lectures we turn our minds to "The Leadership of Christ." The four lectures have as their subjects—His Person; His Ministry; His Death; His Resurrection and His Spirit in the Church. The men are told beforehand that this is to be a "heavy" day for them, and that "doctrine" cannot be kept out. They have responded splendidly, and questions and discussion have

proved that they readily grasp the paramount importance of sound doctrine about the Person of Christ.

Wednesday's lectures are concerned with what Christ our Leader asks of His disciples who would be leaders under Him—loyalty and discipline, sacrifice and service. The great value of a rule of life is stressed; practical ways of helping the work of Christ's Church on R.A.F. stations and in parishes are suggested; and an outline of the "cell" method is presented as a framework within which such work can be done, even if the men find themselves on a station without a chaplain.

For the after-supper session we have thought it good to invite a speaker to present a Christian biography, with the intention of appealing to the imagination and showing what Christian leadership can achieve. Among others, Fr Keble Talbot, C.R., has spoken about Bishop Gore; the Rev. G. K. Tibbatts, Chaplain of Magdalene College, Cambridge, about Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar; and Dr R. Priestley, Vice-Chancellor of Birmingham University, about Captain Scott and his last Polar journey. At some time during the course we have a Question Hour in which the staff try to give answers to the sort of questions men have been asked on their stations.

Services in the College Chapel, Holy Communion, Mattins and Evensong, and Compline, all daily, are voluntarily but well attended.

The staff have been greatly encouraged by the sterling quality of the men whom Chaplains have sent on these courses. They are of all ranks, of widely differing social backgrounds and education, of different schools of thought within the Church. They have quickly welded themselves into a Christian team praying and thinking together, with a common concern and a unity of purpose.

We would, as strongly as we can, support Mr Bowden's plea that the Dioceses should set up such schools without delay; or, at any rate, that each Province should run several such schools in different places, covering the country as adequately as possible. We would go farther, and suggest that some of our more enlightened employers might be persuaded to see the value of these courses in Christian Leadership, and to release their employees with full pay to attend them upon the recommendation of the individual's parish priest. We are certain that the gain to the Church would be immediate and very far-reaching.

Yours sincerely,

ERIC G. JAY, R.A.F.V.R.,
Vice-Principal.

R.A.F. CHAPLAINS' SCHOOL,
MAGDALENE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.
October 2, 1944.

THE CHURCH AND THE SYNAGOGUE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Will you allow me four comments on Fr Gillet?

1. I would agree with his conclusion if I started from his premises. He says that any Christian "taking his stand on the New Testament"

must reject my views. But I do not belong to a branch of the Church which commonly holds the fundamentalist position. I believe it therefore permissible to re-examine the New Testament evidence in the light of the continual revelation of God.

2. Fr Gillet says that my statement that at the period of the separation (after A.D. 80, not, as he says, "about the year 50") the Christology of the Church impaired the unity of God "would be repudiated by any non-Modernist Christian." Prof. H. R. Mackintosh (who would, I think, qualify as a non-Modernist Christian?) says in *The Person of Jesus Christ*, p. 123, "to speak of an official doctrine of Christ in the New Testament is impossible," which implies that some at least of the period taught less than a Nicene theology, and again, in the sub-apostolic age, "Jesus belonged to, *if He did not fill*, the sphere of God" (my italics). In the same passage Mackintosh emphasizes that the Church rejected the humanitarian interpretation. Christ belonged to "the sphere of God." How, was not officially determined. The Christian did not worry about this, and there was no reason why he should. But from a Jewish standpoint, as the absolute unity of God was fundamental to Judaism, what is Mackintosh describing but something which impairs the existing conception of that unity without yet having reached the official restoration of it in a richer form at Nicæa? Fr Gillet's statement makes nonsense, not of some "modernist" idiosyncrasy of mine, but of the reality of the three centuries of profound Christological speculation which preceded Nicæa.

3. Fr Gillet quotes as conclusive that Jewish scholars do not agree with my interpretation. I am concerned with what I believe to be true, not with the measure of agreement on either side which it can yet claim.

4. Fr Gillet chastises me for not having quoted his passage on the Torah on p. 60 of his book. But he at once gives the explanation of my silence: "but we entirely deny that the 'incarnation' of God in Torah could be more than metaphorical." Exactly. As I was not concerned with "metaphorical" incarnations I passed to the passages in which he dealt, not with a metaphorical, but with a real if "incomplete" Jewish parallel doctrine to the Incarnation in the conceptions of the Shekinah and the Memra.

Yours faithfully,
JAMES PARKES.

October 12, 1944.

BOOK REVIEWS

LET US GO FORWARD. By Leslie Stannard Hunter. S.C.M. Press. 2s.

This Primary Charge of the Bishop of Sheffield starts with his own words: "This is how it happened." It ends with those of an unknown group of lay Christians: "We feel that there is need for the Bishop, as Chief Shepherd, to come often among us." Diocese and diocesan alike have contributed to this document, and both are to be congratulated.

The bishop starts with the central affirmation of the being of God

and our response to Him in worship. He establishes the principle involved in the aphorisms, "this is unintelligible, I cannot make head or tail of it," and "this is mysterious, I cannot attain unto it." This is not an easy notion to commend to a generation which has been led to suppose that all that is not immediately expressible is dangerous nonsense and, worse still, produces no observable results.

The second chapter, a discussion of the Anglican tradition, is the least satisfactory part of the charge. It is easy enough to repudiate the sectarian temper. It is equally easy to expound the symphonic nature of the Church. But it is not easy to do this in the day-to-day life of the Church of England and avoid the charge that one is hypostasizing some fourth religious tradition of one's own which is not infected with the defects of the traditional three.

It is a bitter fact that much of the harsh din of the Anglican tradition arises not only from a lack of respect for the conductor; nor simply because we belong to different groups within the orchestra—strings, woodwind, brass. It is that we all play with a fine contempt for the score. This contemporary jam session gives enormous pleasure to the participants. But we have had little enough success in charming the ear of the nation to the extent of persuading it to come and join the band. There is a kind of writing about the Church of England which invites comment by verbatim quotation from St Augustine's anti-Donatist treatises. Dr Hunter is free from the worst excesses. But the uneasy feeling lurks in the wings that our Church has always been like this and is meant by God to be like this and that we must all labour to keep it so. So we leave the problem, "The Church of England. Jam Session or Symphonic Rhapsody?" to the consideration of the reader.

There is a short chapter on the new type of society we are to expect, and Dr Hunter is on the whole for co-operation rather than resistance. Discussing the reorganization of the Church, he professes impenitent adherence to the main principles of *Men, Money and the Ministry*. But he stresses the importance of the ordinary parish as the principal means to the edifying of the body of Christ. But the essential condition of parish life is stability and attachment to place. If fluidity of labour is to be the keynote of peacetime as of wartime Britain, the industrial chaplain will have the same opportunities of evangelism as the Services chaplain. Perhaps no less; but certainly, no more.

On the question of the country parish and the difficulty of arranging opportunities for worship and communion in common, it might be worth while for someone to do a little research into the churchgoing habits of other agricultural communities. We want to know what time they milk their cows in Slovakia and when they make their communions in Co. Galway before we are driven to the desperate and, one would have thought, somewhat urbanized expedient of evening communion which was the conclusion of the late Bishop of Bath and Wells.

The rest of the Charge is made up of a number of discussions of Church life which raise too many topics for cursory treatment here. The fact that they do so is cause for congratulation.

Here is a bishop with a lifetime of parochial experience behind him and an unquenched enthusiasm which enables him still to raise real questions about real issues.

G. L. PHILLIPS.

NORTHOLT.

THE ENGLISH MEDIÆVAL RECLUSE. By Francis D. S. Darwin. S.P.C.K. 6s.

In this clearly-written essay, Mr Darwin has given us a useful account of an interesting and important medieval figure—the anchoret or recluse, a man or woman, living usually near a monastery or a church, in a "cell," which might be no more than a "bed-sitting-room" or might consist of a small house with a garden, but from which the recluse was not allowed to move without the permission of his or her Superior. The recluse is thus not to be confounded with the hermit, who, although he lived alone, could wander about at will. But both recluses and hermits, though they followed a way of life going back to very early times, played their most significant part in religious life in the great devotional movement of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The literature connected with the way of life of these recluses consists of treatises and letters rather than of "rules" in the strict sense of the word, and it extends from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries. Mr Darwin gives some account of this literature, including, of course, the *Ancren Riwle*, but he seems to have been unaware of Fr L. Oliger's edition of the anonymous English treatise of the fourteenth century, the *Speculum Inclusorum* (Rome, 1938), which is a document of first importance in this connexion. Fr Oliger has also an article in *Antonianum*, 1934, which I have not seen, and there is Dom Gougaud's *Ermites et Recluses*, Ligugé, 1928. Fr Oliger gives a complete list of the known "rules," and points out that England is the richest of all countries in respect of this kind of literature. It is through such treatises as the *Speculum Inclusorum*, ascetic and mystical writings, the aim of which is to instruct and encourage recluses in the path of perfection, that this literature is related to the general religious movement of the age. This central devotional movement of the Middle Ages still requires a historian, though much material for such a history was collected by the late Dom A. Wilmart in *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen âge latin*. When the time comes for such a history to be written, the literature centring around the medieval recluse will appear in its true perspective. There is also room, as Dom Wilmart points out in *Revue Bénédictine*, 1934, p. 414, n. 2, in his account of Eva, the English recluse of Angers, for a complete and exhaustive study of hermits and recluses in Western Europe, a subject which he describes as both complex and important.

As Mr Darwin says, we know little of the manner of life lived behind the fast-closed door of the recluse, but we can easily see how individual recluses might gain a reputation not only for austerity and sanctity, but for special gifts of spiritual or prophetic knowledge. It seems to

be Mr Darwin's opinion that it is difficult to estimate whether, on the whole, the institution of the recluse justified itself or no, and suspension of judgment is perhaps the wisest line to take. The dangers of such a manner of life are obvious, and the author of the *Ancren Riwle* has much to say of perpetual gossip at windows. The recluse might become, indeed, "a sort of oracle of a more informal and intimate description than any of those consulted by the ancient Greeks"; the offerings which he received from his consultants were often considerable, though they seem to have gone mostly to the church with which he was associated.

HARPENDEN. F. J. E. RABY.

ST MARTIN IN THE FIELDS, NEW AND OLD. By Katharine A. Esdaile. S.P.C.K. 5s.

A national monument may be studied either as a work of art, when it is judged chiefly on its artistic merit, or simply as a monument, a link with the life and times of those who set it up. It is probably true to say that most visitors to St Martin's view it rather as the first, having but one living association in the work of the late "Dick" Sheppard and his successors. Mrs Esdaile's attractive book will help them to appreciate it also as the second; for here we may see that St Martin's is in truth a monument—to the worship and lives of more and less worshipful men from the thirteenth century until now.

The book, which is in two parts, treats first of the church as it now is; the history up to 1722, when the foundation stone of Gibbs's work was laid, comes second. For the monumentalist and guide this is a proper course, to which the general historian, with his whim for "tracing the course of all things accurately from the first," must defer. The method of glossing successive items in the records with notes on contemporary life and events does sometimes make reading difficult—just occasionally the sentence is lost in its subordinate clauses. But that risk had to be taken in order to produce such a pleasant whole—to present, in fact, St Martin's as a monument at once artistically eminent and historically rich.

At the centre, then, stands the church, seen first as the object of dispute and conveyance in 1222 and 1275, still small and apparently cruciform in 1543, rebuilt to accommodate a larger parish in 1544, restored in 1596, enlarged in 1607, neglected and in disrepair throughout the Commonwealth, "wholly new beautified within" in 1688 and again in 1701, and then demolished in 1721. James Gibbs, whose bust by Rysbrack is in the church, had proved his worth at St Mary-le-Strand, and, with Christopher Cass, his master mason, had the new St Martin's completed by 1726. And so, with minor alterations, today it stands.

To it we see many coming, great and small—kings and queens as parishioners and benefactors, Charles II in christening robe, George I as churchwarden; artists and sculptors, poets and journalists, court officials, favourites and physicians; an acrobat, a poisoner, vandals, vagabonds and thieves—coming, however differently disposed in life,

at least to find a common rest within its walls in death. And always there came the welcome stream, the sick, the homeless and the poor.

This is the picture of St Martin's which Mrs Esdaile's book presents. If anything is lacking, it is a sight of the background against which all these other figures moved—of ordinary people engaged, week by week, in ordinary Sunday worship. Even this cautionary tale, from the diary of an Irish visitor in 1775, would not have been without its value: "*Sunday, March 19th.* Stepped into St Martin's in the Strand, which I saw lighted up, but I could get no further than the door; such a crowd I never saw under one roof. . . . There was one Harrison (as I learned) in the pulpit. . . . No bombast-player in *Tom Thumb* or *Chrononhoton*, etc., ever so roared and so bellowed as he did, and his matter was as lifeless as his manner was hyper-tragic. A man at the door, from whom I learned his name, told me he was a very good liver and a fine preacher, if he had not those ways with him, yet here the poor fellow was deceived, for it was those ways (as he called it) which made him pass for a fine preacher. . . ."[1]

The book has four good plates, including one of the beautiful Vintners' Company tapestry, depicting St Martin and the Beggar.

G. R. Dunstan.

Halifax.

On Earth Peace: A Symposium by Communicants of the Church of England. Edited by Percy Hartill. James Clarke and Co., Ltd. 7s. 6d.

Christ and our Enemies. By Stephen Hobhouse. With a preface by the Archbishop of Canterbury. S.P.C.K. 9d.

After reading this literature I was still asking the questions with which I set out: (1) For what readers are these books designed? (2) In a time of scarcity is this a justifiable expenditure of a bookful of paper?

The essays in *On Earth Peace* certainly are pacifism on the high level—the symposium might well be called the Theology of Pacifism. One does not feel that these particular writers are in danger of losing their loyalty to the Church in their zeal for pacifism, but it does seem to be assumed as a matter of fact (not of opinion) that pacifism is the position and message to which the Church must and will come.

In Canon Grensted's essay, with which the book opens, the desire to transfer the issue from the sphere of practical present-day political problems into that of theology has gone too far: the writer's feet are not on the ground, and therefore he fails to answer his own question. His pacifism is rooted in the instinctive loathing of war rather than in the dialectic, that logic in tension, which must always characterize Christian thinking. Archdeacon Hartill's essay which follows is vitiated by the old proof-text technique and some rather unfair criticism of D. R. Davies and Reinhold Niebuhr. Dr Wright in his account of the Church's attempt in history to outlaw war seems to start from that

[1] The Rev. Dr Thomas Campbell in *An Eighteenth Century Journal, 1774-1776*, compiled by John Hampden. (1940.)

oh! so utterly false premiss that non-pacifists delight in war—the only justification ever offered, so far as I am aware, is that in a particular situation it is the lesser evil.

This is the question on which pacifists must ever part from non-pacifists. Is war as such the supreme evil? Amid much theological writing in this collection I cannot find this question fairly faced. An affirmative answer is assumed throughout, and the writers, in conformity with prevailing fashion, pass to planning the peace and treating of what we hope will be a reunited Church's part in it.

Mr Middleton Murry writes on the rise of the pacifist minority as a factor in politics. His essay has about it a timely realism; he gives an excellent rationale of the breakdown of the League of Nations, that "tacit conspiracy in self-delusion." He has no time for the view that the dispensation of justice is the necessary foundation of love.

Mr Le Messurier, much of whose essay is now hopelessly out of date, waxes passionate in his advocacy of pacifism as the one wise and hopeful application of the Gospel-leaven to this lumpish world. He commits the characteristic human sin of whittling down the Gospel and is over-confident in the blessed effectiveness of what is but Gandhiism in Christian dress. His peering into the post-war world sounds like Coleridge's "ancestral voices prophesying war."

These writers tend, like many other thinkers, to be right in what they assert and wrong in what they deny. Mr Pinder gives an example of constructive thought, but do not let us suppose that the program he outlines is the exclusive discovery of pacifists.

Much of this book gives the impression that pacifists alone have discovered a way ahead: the fact is that for five years now pacifists and non-pacifists have gone along their separate ways, and each have through suffering been enabled to see something of "the Light, that is the true Light, lightening every man." But at present the gulf is fixed, and flanked with misunderstanding at each side.

The atmosphere of Mr Hobhouse's pamphlet is less academically theological, more prayerful. He calls us to prayer for our Nazi enemies most of all, for he sees that war is the complex result of immoral decisions taken by individuals on both sides in the course of history.

In the symposium it seems to be suggested that pacifism is the Christian and therefore the best policy, for war is its own undoing. In the pamphlet pacifism is rather the way of individual perfection.

R. G. Lunt, C.F.

The Akan Doctrine of God. By J. B. Danquah. Lutterworth Press. With nine illustrations by Kofi Antubam of Achimota. 14s.

We are in entire agreement with the publishers of this book in their hope that more natives will write of the religious beliefs of their own peoples. They have facilities denied to foreign research students. From their birth they have lived in the midst of the native environment and, to them, the spiritual atmosphere is as the natural.

This book has been carefully planned. It has five sections followed by a Postscript and two Appendices. Section I deals first with the

search for the Akan God, and then discusses the doctrine arising from it. A fair amount of this is taken up with criticisms of foreign anthropologists. In general, Dr Danquah is of opinion that they are not wholly sound interpreters of native thought. They cannot, he maintains, spend enough time in the country and are "imperfectly acquainted with the native language and ethos of the people." At the same time, he acknowledges that they have done valuable work.

Dr Danquah then proceeds to discuss the Positive Doctrine of God as the Akan perceives it, both as to what He is not as well as what He is. He states that the "Akan knowledge of God teaches that He is the Great Ancestor. He is the true high God and manlike ancestor of the first man." Apprehension of the Great Ancestor is a definite community act and results in a singular name for the being of the Ancestor. He is known as "Onyame," the "Shining One."

Section 2 really gets down to the study of "Onyame," the Akan Deity. As he comes to be worshipped and known, he is called "Nyankopon," the Greater "Shining One," and there follows "Odomankoma," the Creator, *par excellence*, beyond whom there is nothing; he is supreme. The greater part of this section is devoted to the attributes of "Odomankoma."

The remaining sections are concerned with what Dr Danquah describes as "Canons" and "Postulates" of the Doctrine. and the universal utility of the latter. This provides no easy reading, as the language and terms employed are highly academical; in fact, the whole production is more after the style of a degree thesis than a normal book. If the "wayfaring" Akan is expected to subscribe to this dissertation as the articles of his belief then one can only feel sorry for him. Dr Danquah states: "we have to disregard the distinction which Westermann essays to draw between the ideas of West Africa's thoughtful people about God and the ideas of West Africa's crowd about God, for the simple reason that it is illogical to separate a people's philosophers from the philosophy of the people." But this seems to be just what the author has done himself! There can be very few of his own people who are capable of understanding what he has written here. He is one of the "thoughtful" among the Akans, a philosopher among the "crowd." One wonders whether he has allowed his studies of philosophies, ancient and modern, to tempt him to try to make the Akan doctrines fit them.

This is a worthy effort and ably demonstrates the African's ability to think and speak for himself.

G. T. Basden.

Jevington Rectory,
Sussex.

The Divine-Human Encounter. By Emil Brunner. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

This partial revision of lectures delivered at Upsala in 1937 is highly polemical. Brunner has been influenced by the "Oxford Group," and has fallen out with Barth. So he ridicules the Thurneysian doctrines of the invisibility of the fruits of the Spirit and of the exclusive futurity of the kingdom (the great Not-Yet). For him real life is meeting;

that is his central thesis. "In the beginning God created . . .": the emphasis there lies on the verb of which God is the subject. We do not know God as He is in Himself, but in the relation He establishes with us by His Word—that is, in Christ and His work. God is man's Lord, His action is primary though not exclusive. For Him to become the Lord of man, man must respond by faith and enter into fellowship and personal correspondence. The Church thus comes into being.

Brunner claims to have thus restored the Biblical Revelation and to have got behind the Subject-Object Antithesis, a Greek category alien to Biblical thought. Subjectivism, or Pietism, has certain beneficial results, but its ultimate effect is to dissolve the Church. Objectivism may preserve the framework of the Church, but it robs it of its life and makes it torpid. Upon this Objectivism, as seen in Romanism or Neo-Orthodoxy, Brunner pours out the vials of his wrath. He declares war on all impersonal institutionalism, on the distinction between clergy and laity, on the materialism of the Roman Mass, on the Protestant sermon as mere orthodox doctrine. At the same time Christ is said to be present "in, with, and under" both Word and Sacrament, and Infant Baptism is constructively dealt with. The author may therefore intend his philippic against Objectivism to be taken dialectically, however much he may appear to us to have come down on the Subjective side of the fence.

Buber insists that the "moments of the THOU," with all their disturbing and uncanny strangeness, are necessary if man is to know true life. Yet he adds that only as an IT can the THOU enter the structure of knowledge. Brunner, however, would seem to be trying to think and live without the IT, without which man cannot live. Still, he insists on the priority of the Eternal THOU, to whom the human THOU can respond only in dependence on his Lord and Creator, whereas Buber seems to hypostasize the mystic moment of meeting and to confound the Divine and human THOU's. So we may use the two to correct each other.

Brunner, in his modest preface, has disclaimed infallibility and invited the criticism we have, rather impudently, attempted to supply. We must confess the truth of his central thesis, however we disagree with some of the conclusions he draws from it. But that does not alter the fact that this is a great book by a great theologian, and to be received with a gratitude and enthusiasm that should only be the greater because it is irritating as well as profound and stimulating.

The translator, Amandus W. Loos, had a difficult job, but has produced a clear and readable piece of English. The word "gramma" has been misprinted "gamma" on pages 68 and 85.

C. W. QUIN.

DRUMLANE RECTORY,
BELTURBET, CO. CAVAN.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AND THE NON-CHURCHGOER. By G. W. Ireson. S.P.C.K. 6s.

The main thesis of the writer is that in the liturgical action of the Church we are brought face to face with the Truth by which she lives.

But as the masses of this country are without a knowledge of Christian doctrine on which worship is based, there must be a catechumenate for instruction in dogma and worship, before admission to the services of the Church, whether the Eucharist or the Offices. At least there is to be discouragement of church attendance without the previous catechumenate. And there is to be no departure from the worship of the Prayer-Book to make participation easier for the uninstructed. Following this there is much good stuff about instruction, groups, cells, etc.

We may ask, however, how many of those who will come to a Harvest, a Day of Prayer, or when they feel like it, will take kindly to the suggestion that there is little place for them in the public worship of the Church because they have little or no knowledge of the Christian truths? It is significant that the author's principles have been largely hammered out in youth groups. Yes, because the Church has youth groups.

One questions whether there is not a strong case for a widening of the church door, for simple and even popular services, say, on Sunday nights. It does not follow that this is to temper theological presupposition to the measure of unbelief, any more than that where the letter of the Prayer-Book is observed the Word of God is heard. Might we not go far to make the service simple, if thereby we gain many to hear the Evangel proclaimed? So long as it is the Evangel! We need to train our stalwarts, and this book gives much excellent advice in doing so, but we must beware of making pre-worship groups a barrier between the nominal Christian and the Church. The time may come when we shall need just such a barrier, when none will see the mystery until initiated, but while we are a National Church and the attitude of England "neutral" or "neutral-plus," we must make it very easy to hear the Gospel—so long as it is the Gospel. Wherever men hear, stern training follows.

The latter half of the book contains good teaching notes on the liturgical services, and excellent suggestions about drama, symbolism, dramatized services, etc.—all very practical. We recognize the great teaching value of all this, but not to the minimizing (see p. 131) of the supreme evangelistic task—the preaching, by word, of the Word of God.

E. R. Wickham.

The Shrewsbury Hospital,
Sheffield.

The Thrill of Tradition. By James Moffatt. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

"Treat Scripture as if it were a collection of literary souvenirs or a catena of precedents for Church decrees, and the method fails to preserve the authentic rôle of the Word as fatally as any purely mystical or allegorical interpretation. The power of appreciating the Gospel testimony lies with those who are able and willing to reach back into the living past in order to secure some fresh application of the text for to-day." These words (from p. 161) present the gist of a

book characteristic of its author both in the width of culture and exhaustive learning displayed in its pages and the inadequacy of the Christian idealism which is its main theological presupposition. As long as Dr Moffatt is tracing the adventures of "paradosis" among Greek, Rabbinic and Mohammedan philosophers and the Fathers of the Church, he is a most useful and entertaining guide, whom we can follow with equal confidence in his exposure of the insecurity of the "New Trent Religion" in its attitude to tradition. But when we ask, as Dr Moffatt clearly wants us to ask, What is the true tradition, and where is it to be found?, our guide leads us to a morass of "thrills" and "throbs" and experiences and inspirations, and leaves us there. To Dr Moffatt tradition seems to be the milieu of a Spirit defined in terms of subjective inspiration working on a Church which is not defined at all; we feel like applying to him the words which he uses (p. 89) of the Council of Trent: "Ambiguities of language about tradition are mixed up with a steady disinclination to define tradition." It is well to reject the legalism of Trent; but idealism is no substitute for legalism. It is clear that the authentic tradition of the Church can be understood only in the Spirit. But the Spirit, we must believe (unless we are ready to reject the theology of St Paul), is given only after a death in Christ through Baptism, and the most important fact about Baptism is not that it is a thrill given to man but that it is an event coming from God. The true *locus* for receiving tradition is therefore not the inspiration of idealism but the apprehension of dogma; "apprehension" does not of course mean mere intellectual assent to dogmas in blind obedience to authority, but response to them with the wholeness of our being.

R. P. C. Hanson.

Seapatrick Rectory,
Banbridge, Co. Down.

SHORTER NOTICES

Be Ye Perfect. By William Butterfield. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

The human soul, writes Joseph Tissot in *The Interior Life*, is "a splendid portrait, in which God has portrayed his own image"; and, now that it has been marred by sin, only God, the original Artist, can restore it to perfection: "He alone is skilful enough to touch the picture. And he reserves the right of doing so to himself." Dr Butterfield, in this short treatise for "those who are just entering and for those who are already some way along the road to perfection," speaks in a somewhat different strain: "As an artist develops and perfects his picture to an ideal," he writes, "so man develops and perfects his nature to the image of God" (p. 7). And that is why his book, instructive though it is, might do harm if it fell into the wrong hands. He has packed an astonishing amount of sound ascetical doctrine into his eighty pages on the nature of perfection and the means of acquiring it; but he concerns

himself almost exclusively with *askesis* as an activity of man—with the practical "remedies" for sin and the various exercises of piety—and says little or nothing of such fundamental matters as the taking of manhood into God, incorporation into Christ and adherence to Him in His death and resurrection, and the divine initiative in stripping the soul of self and building it up in charity. In short, he says much of the instrumental cause of perfection, little of its principal cause. Of course, he takes these things for granted; but the fact remains that they are not explicit in his writing. Consequently one cannot help feeling that, amid all the wealth of practical expedients, the "beginner" might fail to see the wood for the trees. But although the prudent director will recommend this book only to those who already have the root of the matter in them, he should find it very useful himself.

G. B. Bentley.

Lincoln.

The Beginning of Goodness. By Columba Cary-Elwes. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

A monk of Ampleforth writes for young Roman Catholics who have recently left the college, and offers them spiritual help and guidance. The writer has experience, and it may be that some priests of the Church of England who are concerned with the guidance of youth will find the book useful in parts. But most of the counsel cannot be followed outside the Church of Rome. The young man, for example, who seeks a wife is to take care that his choice falls on a good Catholic.

Ugthorpe. A. C. Scupholme.

Catholic Thought and Modern Psychology. By W. P. Witcutt. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 4s. 6d.

The question of the possibility of reconciling modern psychological principles with "Catholic philosophy," by which is here understood the systematization of the *philosophia perennis* by Aquinas, is one of interest, though not of primary importance to Anglican readers. Mr Witcutt's purpose is to show that, though nothing can be said for Freud and Adler, a good Roman Catholic may quite well follow Jung's leadership without violating anything that he is bound *de fide* to believe. A very useful popular survey of Jung's main beliefs is given, with some indication of their development, as shown in Jung's successive writings, and of their relation to their background in Freud. The chapter on the archetypes is one of the clearest accounts of a difficult subject that I have seen.

L. W. Grensted.

Oxford.

Prisoners' Quest. A Presentation of the Christian Faith in a Prisoners of War Camp. By D. H. Read. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

The thrill of this little book is of course that it contains lectures given by a prisoner of war in Germany to his fellow-prisoners, mostly officers,

with whom he had weekly discussions. They really must have fascinated them, as they give the essential Christian theologumena in a very clear and vivid manner. Whosoever has been in a similar situation knows how open people are to deep thoughts when they have to stay behind barbed wire.

But even apart from the unique circumstances and audience, in some ways more responsive than any other, this new survey of Christian truth is not only remarkably sound and balanced but also its method is sensible. One can see that the final form is the result of discussing the matters with modern people who argued. In this way the lectures are more than doctrinal statements, they are answers to real quests, "apologies" in the original meaning of this rather abused term; *cf.* 1 Pet. iii, 15.

Here are a few sentences which show the author's gift of coining old truths in modern language: "True reverence can never mean the short-circuiting of intellectual processes" (p. 39). "A belief in Determinism is an expression of a desire for the life of the womb, or the Garden of Eden before the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil had been eaten" (p. 102). Mr Read rightly denies the immortality of the soul to be genuinely Christian (p. 61), and fights "the good man" (p. 72) and the nineteenth century's chief dogma of history recorded as "a moving staircase going up" (p. 108). He knows of the biblical wrath of God as an essential feature in His love (p. 137).

It is obvious that the author could not possibly bring politics in. There is, however, one exception when he speaks of a type of man which he calls the military one. Though he gives examples from the N.T. only, one can easily visualize the German sentries standing outside the barbed wire perhaps listening to and even learning from this able British chaplain within.

C. G. Schweitzer.

Wistow Training Centre,
Leicestershire.

Art, Religion and the Common Life. By H. B. Pointing. S.C.M. Press. 1s. 6d.

The true purpose of art is the exploration and revelation of the reality behind appearances. In other words it is, whether the artist himself admit it or not, a religious pursuit; and the creation and contemplation of great art involves a sharing in the divine Creation and the beholding it as good. Artistic achievement is comparable, along a parallel path, to that of the mystic, in piercing the veil of material accidents to reveal that spiritual substance in which matter inheres and (as the physicists themselves now admit) of which it is ultimately composed. Discipline and meditation are essential to inspired vision by either way. The pursuit of art, active or passive, is then one form of worship of Almighty God, in whom all things live and move and have their being. Art has a sacramental quality: it embraces a use of material to disclose the divine; yet its rainbow bridge to extra-material reality is firmly estab-

lished on one side in the world of men, and therefore its aspect alters with the changing character of the society from which it springs, and Art, Religion and the Common Life are mutually interactive. The time may perhaps come again when, as in the period of the great medieval cathedrals, ordinary craftsmen once more contribute to great art reflecting a culture—but more stable and enlightened—in which Christianity is widely recognized as of vital, eternal consequence to men.

There is room for a major work of scholarship concerned with these matters: with æsthetics and religion in relation to human society. Meanwhile Mr Pointing's thoughtful essay along the lines indicated, if no more than a brief purview of a vast and fascinating subject, is both welcome and stimulating.

J. H. L. WATERSON.

RIPON.

William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury

IT is a long time since the death of an Archbishop has been felt as a personal loss by so many people. Dr Temple's life seemed as indispensable to the Church for the period of reconstruction as Mr Churchill's has been to the State for the prosecution of the war. Theologians have particular cause to mourn. When can they expect to see again an Archbishop so qualified to take a leading part in their work, so ready to encourage its promotion, so wide in his intellectual sympathies? However, we may eventually come to see that Dr Temple, as Archbishop of Canterbury, served God and his generation well by working himself to death in a short time. He won the attention of the nation, and aroused hope where hope was dead. He sketched a bold and comprehensive program for Christians in the coming period. But, as the discerning writer of the obituary notice in the *Manchester Guardian* pointed out, he lacked essential qualities of statesmanship. He was not a master of strategy. He failed to settle the priorities among his vast range of interests. It will be the task of his successor to begin to enact the program of reform. Still, we do not see how an Archbishop can set about this properly until he is assisted at Lambeth by a much stronger staff than has hitherto been available.

A. R. V.

INDEX TO VOLUME XLVII

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1944

PAGE

ALLEN, G. F. 108

Beauty for Ashes, or The 1949 Prayer Book 170
BENNETT, F. 145, 237
BENTLEY, G. B. 186

BOOKS REVIEWED:

Anderson, *People, Church and State in Modern Russia* (P. J. Thompson) . 210
Athanasius, St, *The Incarnation of the Word of God* (B. Wigan) . . . 161
Barmen Declaration, The Significance of the (H. P. Ehrenberg) 140
Battiscombe, *Charlotte M. Yonge* (G. Every) 17
Bethell, *Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition* (R. Maxwell) . . 262
Browne, *The Prospects of Islam* (L. M. Schiff) 162
Brunner, *The Divine-Human Encounter* (C. W. Quin) 283
Cadoux, *A Pilgrim's Further Progress* (R. Cant) 116
Case, *The Christian Philosophy of History* (D. R. Davies) 21
Clark, *The Cross and the Eternal Order* (L. W. Grensted) 70
Cocks, *By Faith Alone* (R. Cant) 116
Cross, *Darwell Stone* (Bishop of Oxford) 68
Danquah, *The Akan Doctrine of God* (G. T. Basden) 282
Dark, *Seven Archbishops* (V. H. H. Green) 259
Darwin, *The English Mediæval Recluse* (F. J. E. Raby) 279
Daunt, *When Thou Prayest* (G. Simon) 261
Davies, *Divine Judgment in Human History* (H. Balmforth) 16
Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office* (G. Dix) . . 158
"Erasmian," *The Unrest in Religion* (H. C. L. Heywood) 191
Esdaile, *St Martin in the Fields* (G. R. Dunstan) 280
French, *The Pilgrim Continues his Way* (H. Balmforth) 15
Garlick, *The Wholeness of Man* (F. W. Camfield) 139
Griffith, *Interpreters of Man* (F. W. Camfield) 43
Hartill (Ed.), *On Earth Peace* (R. G. Lunt) 281
Hebert, *The Form of the Church* (A. M. Ramsey) 232
Hobhouse, *Christ and Our Enemies* (R. G. Lunt) 281
Hodgson, *The Doctrine of the Trinity* (J. K. Mozley) 13
Holland, *Christendom in the Modern World* (L. M. Schiff) 256
Holmes, *The Alphabet of Holiness* (S. M. Gibbard) 115
Howard, *Christianity according to St John* (J. D. M. Stuart) 93
Hunter, *Let Us Go Forward* (G. L. Phillips) 277
Huxley, *Evolutionary Ethics* (C. D. Waddams) 48
Ireson, *Christian Worship and the Non-Churchgoer* (E. R. Wickham) . . 284
Jacob, *The Register of Archbishop Chichele* (N. Sykes) 91
Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (N. Sykes) 227
Kissane, *The Book of Isaiah* (C. Witton-Davies) 160
Leavis, *Education and the University* (S. L. Bethell) 71
Levertoff, *Glory in the Face* (L. M. Schiff) 256
Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (L. W. Grensted) 117
Lewis, *The Pilgrim's Regress* (N. Nicholson) 20
McCulloch, *The Trumpet shall Sound* (H. C. L. Heywood) 190
Manson, *Jesus the Messiah* (W. L. Knox) 46
Maritain, *Redeeming the Time* (D. M. Emmet) 42
Massingham, *The Tree of Life* (A. C. Scupholme) 19
Moffatt, *The Thrill of Tradition* (R. P. C. Hanson) 285
Moss, *The Christian Faith* (E. L. Mascall) 90
Nédoncelle, *Suffering* (L. W. Grensted) 96
Nicholson, *Five Rivers* (G. Every) 234
No Other Gospel (H. P. Ehrenberg) 140
Oldmeadow, *Francis Cardinal Bourne* (I. R. Young) 188
Osmond, *Isaac Barrow* (H. F. Stewart) 214
Petre, *Alfred Loisy* (L. J. Collins) 258

PAGE

Ridler, *The Nine Bright Shiners* (G. Every) 234
Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (F. S. Marsh) 213
Russian Letters of Direction (G. Simon) 261
Ryburn, *The Message of Jesus for our Times* (L. M. Schiff) 256
Sampson, *N.T. Readings on the Blessed Sacrament* (S. M. Gibbard) . . 115
Sheed, *The Confessions of St Augustine* (G. B. Bentley) 264
Stark, *The Ideal Foundations of Economic Thought* (R. H. Preston) . . 44
Timasheff, *Religion in Soviet Russia* (P. J. Thompson) 210
Vidler, *Christ's Strange Work* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 95
What the Cross means to me (A. C. Scupholme) 189
Williams, *The Letters of Evelyn Underhill* (F. P. Harton) 113
Wright, *The Greater Victory* (L. W. Grensted) 70
Wyon, *The School of Prayer* (G. Simon) 45
Zabriskie, *Anglican Evangelicalism* (C. F. D. Moule) 137

BOWDEN, G. 194
Breaking the Silence 248

CANT, R. 110
Cathedrals, The Place of 175
Christian looks at the Christian Mission to the Jews, A 218
Christian Thought in War-time China 108
CLARKE, W. K. L. 9, 131
COBHAM, J. O. 185
Comment on "Our Struggle" 151
Community and Worship 32
Confessional Theology and the Anglican Church . . . 51, 110, 133, 186, 254
Correspondence 39, 110, 133, 185, 207, 237, 254, 275

DAUBE, D. 65
DAVIES, H. I. 60
DE CANDOLE, H. 243
DEMANT, V. A. 1
DURHAM, BISHOP OF 75

EHRENBERG, H. P. 237
EVANS, E. 55

FULLER, R. H. 267

GILLET, L. 224
"G. K. C." 271
Good Mrs Trimmer 9
Good or Great Bishops? 126

HEBERT, A. G. 80
Holy Spirit in the New Testament, The 55
HUTCHINSON, D. R. 175

Idol of the Market Place, An 60

JACQUES, J. H. 51
JARRETT-KERR, M. 154
JAY, E. G. 275

Layman and Theology, The 194
Lessons and Lectionaries 243
Let the People Pray 122

MCDERMOTT, R. P. 133, 248
Man and Literature 104

PAGE

Means and Ends 80
Metaphysics of Theism, Mr Austin Farrer's 99

New Testament Terms for Divorce, The 65
"NICODEMUS" 39
Niebuhr, the Dialectical Moralist 1

OLDHAM, J. H. 207
Our Struggle 145, 207, 237

PARKES, J. 218, 276
Pascal and the New Theology 198
PATON, D. M. 254
PRESTON, F. M. 87
Prophetic Character of Episcopacy, The 26

QUIN, C. W. 198

Real Life is Being 154
Remarks on Dr Parkes' Article, Some 224
Sacramental, Some Thoughts upon the 183

SALMON, H. B. 180
SAMPSON, A. 185, 271
SAXON, E. 32
Shorter Notices 22, 118, 141, 164, 191, 216, 236, 286
SIMMS, G. 122
SMITH, H. T. 104
SMITH, R. G. 203
SOUTHAMPTON, BISHOP OF 26
STANIFORTH, J. H. M. 170
Studies in Texts 131
SYKES, N. 126
SYNGE, F. C. 133

THOMPSON, R. C. 209
Training of the Ministry, The 75
TURNER, V. 99

Unitas Episcoporum 180

What is Real Life? 203
William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury 289
WILLIAMS, W. 183
Word of God, The 267

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher